UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,995	01/06/2006	Fabrice Tran Xuan	5284-57PUS	2590

27799   7590   02/03/2009
COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP
551 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 1210
NEW YORK, NY 10176

EXAMINER
DEBROW, JAMES J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/03/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/533,995	TRAN XUAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JAMES J. DEBROW	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>10 November 2008</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>18,21,22,24,25 and 28-32</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>18,21,22,24,25 and 28-32</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10 Nov. 2008</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 10 Nov. 2008.

Claims 18, 21, 22, 24, 25 and 28-32 are pending in this case. Claims 18, 30, 31 and 32 are independent claims.

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's Response dated 10 Nov. 2008, Applicant amended claims 18, 21, and 22; cancelled claims 19, 20, 23, 26 and 27; added new claims 28-32. Applicant argued against all rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated 06 Jun. 2008.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed **10 Nov. 2008** fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for

the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction

of the following is required: The claim recites a *"description file"*. The specification does

not disclose a *"description file"*.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 18, 21, 22, 24, 25, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because

the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 18, 21, 22, 24 and 25:

In summary, **Claim 18** recites a *"system* for dynamically generating an image....."

The Specification of the present application indicates that the *"system"* is comprised

only of a processing stage/module (see Page 2, Line 9-33; See Page 6, lines 5-19).

Thus, for purposes of examination, the examiner interprets the recited *"system"* to be

software per se. That is, the recited *"system"* is not a process, a machine, a

manufacture or a composition of matter.

Accordingly, Claim 18 fails to recite statutory subject matter as defined in 35

U.S.C. 101.

Claims 21, 22, 24, 25, 28 and 29 merely recite further functions performed by the various processing means making up the "*system*". Thus, Claims 21, 22, 24, 25, 28 and 29 do not further define the recited "*system*" as being within a statutory process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter.

Accordingly, Claims 21, 22, 24, 25, 28 and 29 fail to recite statutory subject matter as defined in 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 18, 30, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claim recites a "*description file*". The specification does not disclose a "*description file*".

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 18, 30, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph,

as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject

matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claim(s) recite a *"description file"*.

The specification does not describe the subject matter in such a way as to reasonably

convey meaning of a *"description file"* in this context. The specification does not

disclose a *"description file"*. It is not clear to the Examiner as the meaning of *"description*

file" in this context as the specification does not disclose *"description file"*, thus making it

indefinite. For the purpose of a prior art rejection, the Examiner concludes a description

file to be a XML file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18, 21, 22 and 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Spencer et al. (Pat. No.: US 7,109,985 B2; Filed Dec. 14, 2001)

(hereinafter 'Spencer') in view of Wanderski et al. (Pat. No.: US 6,519,617 B1;

Filed: Apr. 8, 1999) (hereinafter 'Wanderski').

Regarding independent claim 18, Spencer discloses *a system for dynamically*

generating an image to be transmitted to at least one remote terminal, comprising from

a description file of a source image (Abstract; col. 4, lines 10-12; col. 5, lines 7-12; col. 6, lines 39-65; col. 14, lines 9-13; Spencer discloses dynamically generating images intended to be transmitted. Spencer also discloses formatting the dynamically generating image into a specific format. The formatting elements of the images are within an XML page, thus a description file of the source image.), *wherein the description file of the source image comprises:*

    a description of characteristics of said source image (col. 4, lines 10-12; Spenser discloses The formatting elements of the images are within an XML page. It has been established and well known in the art that XML file typically consist of tags. The tags typically consist of attributes/characteristics which are used to describe/format the source image the represent.).

    a description of said source image (col. 4, lines 10-12; Spenser discloses The formatting elements of the images are within an XML page. It has been established and well known in the art that XML file typically consist of tags. The tags typically consist of attributes which are used to describe/format the source image the represent.); *and*

    one or more tags adapted to cause manipulation of all or part of said source image (col. 4, lines 24-38; col. 6, lines 1-24; Spencer discloses an image tag which is used to manipulate an existing image or create a new image. Spencer also discloses manipulating metadata of vectors images such as Scalable Vector Graphics (SVG). Thus Spencer implicitly teaches at least one tag adapted to cause a manipulation of all or part of said source image.).

Spencer does not expressly disclose wherein said system comprises processing

means for generating a modified description file by replacement of at least one tag of

said one or more tags in the description file of said source image by an instruction code

according to argument values conveyed by a request received from the at least one

remote terminal; and

processing means for converting the modified description file into an image

having a format that is compatible with said at least one remote terminal.

Wanderski teaches *wherein said system comprises processing means for*

generating a modified description file by replacement of at least one tag of said one or

more tags in the description file of said source image by an instruction code according

to argument values conveyed by a request received from the at least one remote

terminal (col. 7, line 49-col. 8, line 18; col. 11, lines 5-59; col. 14, lines 43-47; Wanderski

teaches modifying a XML document *(description file)* so that it has tags that suggest

transformation into a dialect that adapts dynamically to a particular user's context. This

user context may comprise one or more preference of a user, e.g. a device type of said

user. In other words, a modified XML document is generated/transformed to the type of

device and browser the user is currently using.) and

processing means for converting the modified description file into an image

having a format that is compatible with said at least one remote terminal (col. 4, lines

15-23; col. 7, line 23-col. 8, line 18; col. 10, lines 33-47; col. 11, lines 5-59; col. 12, lines

33-49; Wanderski teaches modifying a XML document *(description file)* so that it has

tags that suggest transformation into a dialect that adapts dynamically to a particular

user's context. This user context may comprise scaling images larger or smaller;

converting embedded images to hypertext links to the image file (giving the user the

option of whether to request the image); removing information such as sensitive

material or comment from the document. Wanderski teaches the modified tag requests

a transformation of an image to grayscale of the output document. Wanderski also

teaches XML elements specify dynamic-determined transformation directives that are

desired to transform the input document. For example, transforming a document to

reflect user context, thus a format that is compatible with the type of device and browser

the user is currently using.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to combine Wanderski with Spencer for the benefit of providing a

technique of modifying an XML document to create a dynamically-generated XML

dialect in a manner that adapts to a particular user's context (col. 4, lines 26-42).

Regarding dependent claim 21, Spencer does not expressly disclose *a system*

according to claim18, wherein said means for converting the modified description file

and the processing means for generating the modified description file are hosted in the

server.

Wanderski teaches *wherein said means for converting the modified description file and the processing means for generating the modified description file are hosted in the server* (col. 7, lines 23-39; Wanderski teaches the present invention is implemented as one or more computer software programs that may operate on a server in a network. The server may be functioning as Web server that provides service in response to requests from a client connected through the Internet.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Wanderski with Spencer for the benefit of providing a technique of modifying an XML document to create a dynamically-generated XML dialect in a manner that adapts to a particular user's context (col. 4, lines 26-42).

Regarding dependent claim 22, Spencer does not expressly disclose *a system according to claim 18, wherein said processing means for generating a modified description file are hosted in a server and said processing means for converting the modified description file are hosted by said remote terminal.*

Wanderski teaches *wherein said processing means for generating a modified description file are hosted in a server and said processing means for converting the modified description file are hosted by said remote terminal* (col. 7, lines 9-39; Wanderski teaches the present invention is implemented as one or more computer software programs that may operate on a server in a network. The server may be functioning as Web server that provides service in response to requests from a client connected through the Internet. Wanderski also teaches that alternatively the software

may operate on a user's computer. The user's computer may be any type of computer

processor, including laptop, handheld or mobile computer, vehicle-mounted devices,

desktop computers etc., thus remote terminal, having processing capabilities.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to combine Wanderski with Spencer for the benefit of providing a

technique of modifying an XML document to create a dynamically-generated XML

dialect in a manner that adapts to a particular user's context (col. 4, lines 26-42).

Regarding dependent claim 28, Spencer does not expressly disclose *a system*

according to claim 18, wherein said argument values comprises tag attributes values

and said processing means for converting the modified description file comprises

means for inserting said argument values in corresponding tag attributes.

Wanderski teaches *argument values comprises tag attributes values and said*

processing means for converting the modified description file comprises means for

inserting said argument values in corresponding tag attributes (col. 9, line 43-col. 10,

lines 23; col. 10, line 48-col. 11, line 4; col. 11, line 48-col. 12, line 49; Fig. 4; Wanderski

teaches a USER-CONTEXT element which is used to tailor dynamically-changing

context. The USER-CONTEXT element consists of sub-elements such as <USER>,

<DEVICE> and <NETWORK-BANDWIDTH> to reflect dynamic factors in the user's

context. The values of the elements represent the attributes of each element.

Wanderski also teaches preference information/dynamic factors elements used to

determine a set of transforms. The desired transforms are dynamically selected for the

particular user at the time the current document requested is being processed.

Wanderski further teaches attribute types/values may be generated for XML. Using the

broadest reasonable interpretation, the Examiner concludes the dynamic factors

represented by the USER-CONTEXT element and it's value to be analogous with the

argument values comprises tag attributes values of the current invention as both are

used in specifying the context element specified by the user. Wanderski also teaches

modifying a XML document *(description file)* so that it has tags that suggest

transformation into a dialect that adapts dynamically to a particular user's context. This

user context may comprise one or more preference of a user, e.g. a device type of said

user. Thus Wanderski teaches *the modified description file comprises means for*

inserting said argument values in corresponding tag attributes whereby providing

transformation into a dialect that adapts dynamically to a particular user's context)

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to combine Wanderski with Spencer for the benefit of providing a

technique of modifying an XML document to create a dynamically-generated XML

dialect in a manner that adapts to a particular user's context (col. 4, lines 26-42).

Regarding dependent claim 29, Spencer does not expressly disclose *a system*

according to claim 18, wherein said description is provided in a language which is an

XML application, said instruction code being generated into said language (col. 4, lines

24-38; col. 6, lines 1-24; Spencer discloses an image tag which is used to manipulate

an existing image or create a new image. Spencer also discloses manipulating

metadata of vectors images such as Scalable Vector Graphics (SVG). As Applicant

admits within the specification, page 5, lines 14-16, an SVG file is an XML application.).

Regarding independent claim 30, Spencer discloses *a method for dynamically*

generating images to be transmitted to at least one remote terminal from description

files of source images, wherein a description file of a source image comprises:

a description of the characteristics of said source image (col. 4, lines 10-12;

Spenser discloses The formatting elements of the images are within an XML page. It

has been established and well known in the art that XML file typically consist of tags.

The tags typically consist of attributes/characteristics which are used to describe/format

the source image the represent.).

a vector description of said source image (col. 4, lines 24-38; col. 6, lines 1-24;

Spencer discloses an image tag which is used to manipulate an existing image or

create a new image. Spencer also discloses manipulating metadata of vectors images

such as Scalable Vector Graphics (SVG). Vector formats allow limitless scaling and

rotation of imagery without the pixel resampling. Images can be acquired in a Simple

Vector graphics (SVG) file format. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, the

Examiner concludes the SVG file formatting the image data to be analogous with a

vector description of said source image because they both provides formatting data of

the image.).

at least one tag adapted to cause manipulation of all or part of said source image

(col. 4, lines 24-38; col. 6, lines 1-24; Spencer discloses an image tag which is used to

manipulate an existing image or create a new image. Spencer also discloses

manipulating metadata of vectors images such as Scalable Vector Graphics (SVG).

Thus Spencer implicitly teaches at least one tag adapted to cause a manipulation of all

or part of said source image.).

Spencer does not expressly disclose *wherein said method comprises:*

generating a modified description file by replacing at least one tag with an

instruction code in the description file of the source image according to an

argument value conveyed by a request from a remote terminal; and

converting the modified description file into an image having a format that

is compatible with said remote terminal.

Wanderski teaches *generating a modified description file by replacing at least*

one tag with an instruction code in the description file of the source image according to

an argument value conveyed by a request from a remote terminal (col. 7, line 49-col. 8,

line 18; col. 11, lines 5- col. 12, line 49; col. 14, lines 43-47; Fig. 4; Wanderski teaches

modifying a XML document *(description file)* so that it has tags that suggest

transformation into a dialect that adapts dynamically to a particular user's context. This

user context may comprise one or more preference of a user, e.g. a device type of said

user. In other words, a modified XML document is generated/transformed to the type of

device and browser the user is currently using. Wanderski further teaches a USER-

CONTEXT element which is used to tailor dynamically-changing context. The USER-

CONTEXT element consists of sub-elements such as <USER>, <DEVICE> and <NETWORK-BANDWIDTH> to reflect dynamic factors in the user's context. The values of the elements represent the attributes of each element.).

converting the modified description file into an image having a format that is compatible with said remote terminal (col. 4, lines 15-23; col. 7, line 23-col. 8, line 18; col. 10, lines 33-47; col. 11, lines 5-59; col. 12, lines 33-49; Wanderski teaches modifying a XML document *(description file)* so that it has tags that suggest transformation into a dialect that adapts dynamically to a particular user's context. This user context may comprise scaling images larger or smaller; converting embedded images to hypertext links to the image file (giving the user the option of whether to request the image); removing information such as sensitive material or comment from the document. Wanderski teaches the modified tag requests a transformation of an image to grayscale of the output document. Wanderski also teaches XML elements specify dynamic-determined transformation directives that are desired to transform the input document. For example, transforming a document to reflect user context, thus a format that is compatible with the type of device and browser the user is currently using.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Wanderski with Spencer for the benefit of providing a technique of modifying an XML document to create a dynamically-generated XML dialect in a manner that adapts to a particular user's context (col. 4, lines 26-42).

Regarding independent claims 31 and 32, Spencer discloses *a server for*

dynamically generating images from description files of source images, wherein a

description file of a source image comprises (col. 14, lines 9-13; col. 14, lines 39-60;

Spencer discloses a dynamic imaging server to format an image into a specific image

format.)*:*

a description of the characteristics of said source image (col. 4, lines 10-12;

Spenser discloses The formatting elements of the images are within an XML page. It

has been established and well known in the art that XML file typically consist of tags.

The tags typically consist of attributes/characteristics which are used to describe/format

the source image the represent.).

a vector description of said source image (col. 4, lines 24-38; col. 6, lines 1-24;

Spencer discloses an image tag which is used to manipulate an existing image or

create a new image. Spencer also discloses manipulating metadata of vectors images

such as Scalable Vector Graphics (SVG). Vector formats allow limitless scaling and

rotation of imagery without the pixel resampling. Images can be acquired in a Simple

Vector graphics (SVG) file format. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, the

Examiner concludes the SVG file formatting the image data to be analogous with a

vector description of said source image because they both provides formatting data of

the image.).

at least one tag adapted to cause manipulation of all or part of said source

image (col. 4, lines 24-38; col. 6, lines 1-24; Spencer discloses an image tag which is

used to manipulate an existing image or create a new image. Spencer also discloses

manipulating metadata of vectors images such as Scalable Vector Graphics (SVG).

Thus Spencer implicitly teaches at least one tag adapted to cause a manipulation of all

or part of said source image.).

Spencer does not expressly disclose *wherein the server comprises:*

processing means for generating a modified description file by

replacement of at least one tag in the description file of the source image with an

instruction code according to an argument value conveyed by a request received

from a remote terminal; and

a transmitter for transmitting the modified description file to said remote

terminal for conversion to an image having a format that is compatible with said

remote terminal.

Wanderski teaches *wherein the server comprises* (col. 7, lines 13-39; Wanderski

teaches a remote server that provides services in response to requests from a client

connected through the Internet.).

processing means for generating a modified description file by

replacement of at least one tag in the description file of the source image with an

instruction code according to an argument value conveyed by a request received

from a remote terminal (col. 7, line 49-col. 8, line 18; col. 11, lines 5- col. 12, line

49; col. 14, lines 43-47; Fig. 4; Wanderski teaches modifying a XML document

(description file) so that it has tags that suggest transformation into a dialect that

adapts dynamically to a particular user's context. This user context may comprise

one or more preference of a user, e.g. a device type of said user. In other words,

a modified XML document is generated/transformed to the type of device and

browser the user is currently using. Wanderski further teaches a USER-

CONTEXT element which is used to tailor dynamically-changing context. The

USER-CONTEXT element consists of sub-elements such as <USER>,

<DEVICE> and <NETWORK-BANDWIDTH> to reflect dynamic factors in the

user's context. The values of the elements represent the attributes of each

element.).

   a transmitter for transmitting the modified description file to said remote

terminal for conversion to an image having a format that is compatible with said

remote terminal (col. 4, lines 15-23; col. 7, line 23-col. 8, line 18; col. 10, lines 33-

47; col. 11, lines 5-59; col. 12, lines 33-49; Wanderski teaches modifying a XML

document *(description file)* so that it has tags that suggest transformation into a

dialect that adapts dynamically to a particular user's context. This user context

may comprise scaling images larger or smaller; converting embedded images to

hypertext links to the image file (giving the user the option of whether to request

the image); removing information such as sensitive material or comment from the

document. Wanderski teaches the modified tag requests a transformation of an

image to grayscale of the output document. Wanderski also teaches XML

elements specify dynamic-determined transformation directives that are desired

to transform the input document. For example, transforming a document to reflect

user context, thus a format that is compatible with the type of device and browser

the user is currently using.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to combine Wanderski with Spencer for the benefit of providing a

technique of modifying an XML document to create a dynamically-generated XML

dialect in a manner that adapts to a particular user's context (col. 4, lines 26-42).

NOTE

It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the

prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to

be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon

for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See MPEP 2123.

**Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Spencer in view of Wanderski further in view of Haung et al. (Pub. No.: US

2002/0147748 A1; Effective filing Date: July. 17, 2001) (hereinafter 'Haung').**

Regarding dependent claim 24, Spencer in view of Wanderski does not

expressly disclose *a system according to claim 18, wherein said processing means*

further comprise means for generating a stylesheet adapted to insert presentation data into the images.

Haung teaches *processing means further comprise means for generating a stylesheet adapted to insert presentation data into the images* (0045; 0052; 0076; 0091; Haung teaches generating a stylesheet adapted to insert presentation data into the images.).

There at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Haung with Spencer in view of Wanderski for the benefit of using met-tag information to design extensible style-sheets (XML) for transferring a source XML file into a target file (0014).

Regarding dependent claim 25 Spencer in view of Wanderski does not expressly disclose *a system according to claim 24, wherein said means for generating said stylesheet comprise means for generating said stylesheet according to data transmitted from the remote terminals.*

Haung teaches *means for generating said stylesheet comprise means for generating said stylesheet according to data transmitted from the remote terminal* (0045; 0052; 0076; 0091; Haung teaches the stylesheet may be created in a computing device, which may be a server or a desktop computer.).

There at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Haung with Spencer in view of Wanderski for the benefit of

using met-tag information to design extensible style-sheets (XML) for transferring a

source XML file into a target file (0014).

NOTE

It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the

prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to

be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon

for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See MPEP 2123.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10 Nov. 2008 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is

made in view of Wanderski, Spencer and Haung.

It is noted that Applicant's amendment to the independent claim changes the

significantly scope of the claimed invention when interpreted as a whole.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to James J. Debrow whose telephone number is 571-272-

5768. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAMES DEBROW
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2176

/DOUG HUTTON/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2176